



TITLE:

# <Review Articles>The Nature of Land and Labour Endowments to Sasana in Medieval Burmese History: Review of the Theory of "Merit-path-to-salvation"

AUTHOR(S):

Aye Chan

---

CITATION:

Aye Chan. <Review Articles>The Nature of Land and Labour Endowments to Sasana in Medieval Burmese History: Review of the Theory of "Merit-path-to-salvation". 東南アジア研究 1988, 26(1): 86-95

ISSUE DATE:

1988-06

URL:

<http://hdl.handle.net/2433/56317>

RIGHT:

Review Article

**The Nature of Land and Labour Endowments to  
Sasana in Medieval Burmese History:  
Review of the Theory of "Merit-path-to-salvation"**

AYE CHAN\*

A Review of Michael Aung-Thwin's

*Pagan: The Origins of Modern Burma*\*\*

**I Introduction**

Michael Aung-Thwin deserves congratulation for being the first scholar to bring the State-Sangha relations of medieval Burma under wide scrutiny. His book, *Pagan: The Origins of Modern Burma*, (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1985) will doubtless be greeted by Burma-Scholars of various disciplines as a long awaited contribution to Burmese historiography, an institutional history of the Pagan Empire. And his attempt to describe the whole society, its strengths and weaknesses, its organizing principles, its *raison d'être*, and its legacy (p. 3) constitutes the most enterprising achievement of all research that has been carried out on Burma so far. This is because

Pagan, the first classical Burmese kingdom, left hundreds of lithic inscriptions, which are the only primary source materials, and which are informative in a very narrow way about land and labour endowments to Sasana (the Buddhist Church).

Michael Aung-Thwin concludes that the classical system of the state consisted of five fundamental components: (1) Theravada Buddhism, which was primarily based on the popular belief of *Merit-path-to-salvation*; (2) an economy of redistribution; (3) an administration based on an agrarian environment; (4) a cellular and hierarchic social organization; and (5) codified law, which was the guiding framework of Burmese society at least until the British conquest in 1886 (pp. 199–200). He argues for the continuity of the basic socio-economic institutions despite the dynastic changes throughout the history of pre-modern Burma; and he explains in detail that the *Merit-path-to-salvation* led to a flow of wealth,

\* Department of History, Rangoon University, University P.O., Rangoon, Burma

\*\* 1985, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press. 264pp.

especially land and labour, to the Sangha as a repository for tax-exempt resources, while the state practised Sasana (religious) reform or purification in order to regain control of the resources (p. 203). According to Aung-Thwin, monastic landlordism and Sasana purification occurred as cause and effect, the same pattern repeating itself and periodically troubling the central administration. He identifies the failure of King Klacwa (r. 1234–49) and his successors' attempt to reduce Sangha's wealth and power as the underlying cause of the fall of the Pagan dynasty at the end of thirteenth century. Likewise, King Mindon's sponsorship of the Fifth Great Synod in the late nineteenth century and the present government's sponsorship of religious purification are also regarded as evidence of the same pattern (pp. 209–211). Although V.B. Lieberman has already discussed the political significance of religious wealth in Burmese history, I would like to discuss this further before focussing on some other minor factors supporting Aung-Thwin's theory.

## II The Nature of Land and Labour Endowments to Sasana

Most of the inscriptions indicate the location of the lands dedicated to Sasana almost all of which were situated only in the Khuruiñ and Tuik areas of the dry zone.<sup>1)</sup> According to the royal inquests (Sittans) of the Konebaung period, glebe lands were found only in a few towns in Lower Burma.<sup>2)</sup> The reason is that

only the political and economic elites of the kingdom, who mostly lived in and around the capital city, made land and labour endowments to Sasana. Michael Aung-Thwin's meticulous calculation of the acreage of glebe land up until A.D. 1300 shows a total of 208,222 *pays* (364,389 acres or 147,577 hectares) (p. 187), and in the Pinya-Sagaing and Ava periods (1312–1555) the land endowments were continuously made mostly in the dry zone. If we calculate carefully the total acreage of glebe lands in the dry zone during these latter periods and compare the two figures with the total area of arable lands in the dry zone today, the result leads inevitably to scepticism. In addition, we should be exceedingly careful in converting the figures in the inscriptions into modern units such as acre and hectare in order to investigate the percentage of the arable land of modern Burma that was dedicated to Sasana in those days. The Pagan inscriptions give the area of glebe land mostly in the Burmese unit *pay*, but sometimes the units *namuiñ* and *tamuiñ* are used [Than Tun 1956: Appendix I] and sometimes the units are omitted [Pl. 66/22; *List* 179; Pl. 41/5–6; *SHMK*: 113/17–21]. Actually, we do not know the area of the *pay* in the Pagan period, and the equivalent (1 *pay* = 1.77 acres) is mentioned only in the literature of Konebaung period. And we know nothing about the other two units. Even in the Konebaung period, the *pay* was of two kinds: *pakati pay* and *mañ: pay* [Than Tun 1956: Appendix I]. Thus the accuracy of Aung-Thwin's calculation depends on whether the *pay* in the Pagan period was the same as the *pakati pay* in the Konebaung period.

In medieval Burma, the king, described as

1) See column (3) in [*List* Pt. I] for the original locality of the inscriptions.

2) See the 1783, 1784 and 1802 Land Rolls of Southern Burma in [Trager and Koenig 1979].

“the lord of all land and water” [Pl. 353/10–11; Pl. 426/3], was theoretically the ultimate owner of all land. The king granted land to his servants [Pl. 463/7] and sold land to freemen,<sup>3)</sup> and land could be dedicated to Sasana only with the approval of the king. Often in the Pinya-Sagaing and Ava periods, inscriptions carry the phrase “Mriy kuiw pan ruy”<sup>4)</sup> (literally, “petitioning for land”).

Although Michael Aung-Thwin uses the term “monastic landlordism,” the glebe lands of Burma betray certain differing characteristics. It is clear that not all glebe lands in Burma were dedicated to the Sangha. Burmese Buddhists have believed since the Pagan period that the Three Gems, i.e., *Phura* (Buddha), *Tara* (His teaching), and Sangha (His disciples), are the only fields where one can sow the seeds of merit (*kusuil*). Since the death of Buddha, Buddha images and the pagodas and temples where his relics are said to have been enshrined represent the Buddha himself. Because most temples and pagodas were not under the control of the monks, the lands dedicated to them were not owned by Sangha. Careful reading of the epigraphic accounts reveals clearly whether the land was dedicated to the *Phura* (pagoda or temple) or to the Sangha. Some inscriptions do not mention the Sangha and state explicitly that all lands were dedicated to the pagoda or temple [UB 1900: 287; Pl. 377; ASB 1958–59 (PM 148);

ASB 1962–63 (MNK 598)]. The following inscription of A.D. 1222 testifies:

I, Mañramaklasaṇ, offered five pays of land in Taconkrañṇ, five kywans [slaves] named . . . to the temple (*kuha*) . . . erected by my father. The five kywans were dedicated on condition that they would earn their livelihood on the temple's charity [i.e. the land] [Pl. 377(A)/3–9].

The Burmese believe that it is necessary to pour water onto the ground (*recackhya*) in the ceremony of religious offering to keep the earth as witness, and that one has to share his merit with all the beings (visible or invisible) who saw or heard his merit-making. Traditionally it was monks who had to lead the ceremony. This explains why the names of monks are generally present in the inscriptions. To view the Sangha as the receiver of the offering in such cases would be mistaken. The following inscription mentions the Sangha only as witness.

Nine adult men and women as kywans, five pays of land, five milking cows were dedicated to the Lord Buddha (*Phura Sakhaṇ*). Those who saw my good deed were Sikhaṇ Naronsana . . . and Sikhaṇ Naplusana [ASB 1962–63 MNK 598/8–10].

Sometimes the land was divided among the Three Gems:

Pitarac, the tutor of the king, dedicated seventy-three slaves and fifty pays of land as Mahadan [Great Offering]. These fifty pays are registered at [the office] of Mahasaman as twenty pays for *Phura* [Buddha], five pays for *Tarya* [His teaching] and ten pays for *Thera* [His disciples] [SHMK 1972: 257–258 (PM 597/4–27)].

In this case there is no doubt that the Sangha should have received the share for the *Tarya*, as the propagator of the Dhamma.

3) Colhayaññisaṇmokyōṇ: Inscription, Sagaing, Line 4–7 [UB 1900: 126–127].

4) Mahasihasurakyoṇ: Inscription (B.E. 808), Sagaing, Line 24–25. Khawaitoṇmracañṇ: khuṇ Pagoda Inscription (B.E. 844), Line 1–2 [UB 1900: 128–129]. Athin: tokyōṇ: Inscription (B.E. 868) Line 1–2 [UB 1900: 131–132].

To understand the role of glebe land, we should carefully examine the distribution of its produce rather than its seignior. In other words we are curious about the people who were responsible for managing the cultivation of the dedicated land and the maintenance of the religious buildings funded by the produce gathered from the dedicated land. There are a few sources to help us solve this matter. An inscription of A.D. 1171 tells us about the land dedicated to the temple as follows,

... Let them [the kywans] eat by their inheritance. They must not sell it [the land]. The land would be with the temple even though sold by them [*SHMK* 1972: 38; *ASB* 1958-59].

An inscription of A.D. 1233 reads,

... Nineteen pays of land with the paddy is dedicated to Phurhakri [Great pagoda] by pouring the water. Ten Kywans [slaves] who were going to feed (*klwaññ* *racciy*) the pagoda, are dedicated [Pl. 99/9-15].

Here the old form of the Burmese verb "*klwaññ*" is translated into English as "feed," but it was used probably in the meaning of "support." There are other expressions in other inscriptions, such as, "The Kywans are to offer light and food to the pagoda (*chimi: sañput wat maprat tañceran*) [Pl. 536/45], and "On behalf of me [the donor] to support the Three Gems" (*Ratanasūṃpa: kuiw lupklwaññ ceran*) [Pl. 510/9-10].

The monastery (*kloñ*), the temple (*kuha*) and the image or stupa (*phura*) of the Burmese Buddhist edifices should be distinguished. The *kloñ* is the sanctuary for the Sangha, while the *kuha* and *phura* are places for worshipping the Buddha, whose maintenance was generally not the Sangha's responsibility. In later periods they were under the trusteeship of the laity or

the state. Thus it would not be unreasonable to assume that the kywans (pagoda slaves) had the responsibility of maintaining the pagodas and the temples, earning their livelihood from the yield of the glebe land they cultivated. Actually, when the donor had died, it was the kywans who managed the distribution of produce and the maintenance of buildings.

There is more evidence to support this statement. When a whole village was dedicated to a pagoda as kywans (pagoda slaves), an inscription would state that the farmers were to cultivate the glebe land and that a fixed share of the yield must be given to the artisans, such as the carpenters, carvers, masons, decorators, brick bakers and sculptors, who were responsible for maintaining the pagoda and temple. It is clear that precautions were taken to prevent the farmers who cultivated the land from exploiting the shares of the artisans who had to repair the buildings [*Khin Khin Sein* 1971]. An inscription of A.D. 1223 states:

For the perpetuity [of the monastery and the pagoda] throughout five thousand years of the era of Sasana, prearrangements have been made. We, the husband and the wife, dedicated the kywans named ..., who are on our behalf to repair [the monastery and pagoda], to clean up the buildings, to offer food, light and flowers to Buddha images, and to give the food to the Sangha who endure with forbearance [*List* 190; *UB* 1900: 73].

Though of the later period, an inscription of A.D. 1485 tells about the kywans (slaves) and a plantation of sugar-palm dedicated to Sasana:

Let the *Asaññ*, *Ala* and the village headman, who take care of the sugar-palm trees I planted, eat by inheritance one out of ten,

ten out of one hundred and one hundred out of one thousand [according to the number which they take care of] . . . The mason, the carver, the carpenter and black smith are to be given one hundred [trees] each. The Kywans who have not been given the full quota of land for their livelihood are to get one hundred [trees] each, and the Kywans who have been given the full quota of land for their livelihood are to get fifty [trees] each.<sup>5)</sup>

In this case, the Asaññ, Ala and the village headman seem to have been entrusted to oversee the plantation. Than Tun has pointed out that when a whole village was dedicated as Phura kywans (pagoda slaves) in the Pagan period, the administrative officers of the village, namely, the village headman (*sukri*), the overseer of the agricultural farms (*kumtam*) and the minor headmen (*Sañkri* and *Sañlhyañ*) also became kywans (slaves) [Than Tun 1964: 7–10]. Thus we can assume with a considerable degree of certainty that both the production and distribution of the output of the land dedicated to the pagodas and temples were managed by the kywans, the so-called pagoda slaves.

Although we are using the English word “slave” for the Burmese word “kywan,” those who were dedicated to the pagodas were never actually bound to serve anybody but were obliged merely to maintain the pagoda. An inscription of A.D. 1228 testifies:

We, the husband and the wife, built a brick monastery for the salvation from distress (*chaññray*). Since we cannot get the kywans or cattle, four daughters of our own named . . . are dedicated to the brick

monastery we erected [ASB 1964–65 (PM 159/7–10)].

In these inscriptions, the word “kywans” means only the people who were responsible for taking care of the pagoda or monastery. There is no other reason for anyone to dedicate his own children as slaves after erecting a religious building at his own expense. Daw Khin Khin Sein has also pointed out that some high officials, such as *Kalan*, *Sañbyañ* and *Amat*, also devoted themselves and their families as kywans of the pagodas and monasteries they built [Khin Khin Sein 1971]. Thus we cannot consider that such kind of labour was transferred to the Sangha.

Nevertheless, one may ask why the sect of forest-dwelling monks, who tenaciously maintained their landholdings for nearly three centuries, especially in the Chindwin valley, should not be called monastic landlords. In this case, we know very little about how far the sect controlled the productivity of the land. We do know for certain that, until the sect disappeared from the scene in the early sixteenth century, they used to authorize laity to represent the sect when they faced a lawsuit or entered a contracts for the purchase of land [Than Tun 1959a].

### III Royal Control of Religious Wealth

Since labour was the essential force in the dynamism of the medieval agrarian economy, the land remained fallow when human resources were depleted. During the Pinya-Sagaing period (1312–64), the dry zone suffered a severe decrease in population as a result of Tai raids from the north and north-

5) Ratanaceti Chañmyarhañ Pagoda Inscription (B.E. 847), Sagaing, Line 24–27 [UB 1900: 91–92].

east, because the hillmen never confined themselves merely to pillage, but occasionally brought back the human elements of the valley. Contemporary inscriptions tell us that thousands of acres of glebe land were abandoned until the last decades of the fourteenth century.<sup>6)</sup> The tenantless situation of this disastrous period caused a loss of land to Sasana.

The revenue from glebe land fell under the control of the state in the later periods for two reasons: (1) Sasana could not defend its wealth when the central administration collapsed at the fall of a dynasty, because the Theravadin monks of Burma never built up any kind of armed force to defend themselves like the Japanese warrior monks; and (2) the royal monopolization of land revenue gradually engulfed the authority of the custodianship of all the glebe land, because the king became the sole tithe-collector in the later periods. There are a few records of the king's attempt to confiscate glebe land in contemporary inscriptions. Michael Aung-Thwin suggests that all these incidents were struggles of the state to regain the wealth of the Sangha. We should note not only the attempt of King Klacwa (r. 1235–49) to confiscate the glebe lands (though he retracted later) but also his endowment of land and labour to Sasana [*List* 280; Pl. 165(B)]. In the case of King Mohnyin Thado (r. 1426–39), the territory of the Burman kingdom under the Ava dynasty was not more than the inland dry zone [*List* 1014/14–15; Than Tun 1975: 437], and the court seems to have relied solely

on agriculture; the highland areas, which produce precious minerals and forest products, and the coastal entrepôts, the main sources of the lucrative revenues, were under the suzerainty of Tai and the Mon rulers respectively.

The Taungoo kings, who ruled the second unified empire, paid remarkable attention to the protection of religious lands. King Bayinnaung (r. 1551–81) relinquished all the glebe lands confiscated by King Mohnyin Thado of the Ava dynasty and rededicated them to Sasana [Lun 1920: 114]. The following edict of 18 November 1630 proclaimed by King Thalun shows the control of the religious land by the government.

Collect all the records of religious monuments like pagodas and religious establishments like monasteries and find out the exact limits or boundaries of the religious lands dedicated to these foundations by their founders, like the previous nineteen kings of Ava starting with Thadominbya. . . . Check all records of land revenue so that no revenue either in cash or in kind from the religious land had been deposited in the Royal Treasury or Royal Granary through mistake or ignorance. Copy all the records of the religious lands for the palace archives [Than Tun 1985: 32].

Although the edicts suggest that the measures were intended to prevent the flow of revenues from religious lands to the royal granary, V.B. Lieberman has pointed out that religious revenues were increasingly controlled by central officials after the year 1635, and that the produce from certain glebe lands was deposited in the royal treasury under the so-called *Maha-dan-wun* (Minister for Large Donations) [Lieberman 1980: 762]. In the Konebaung period, the *Wutmye-wun* (Minister for the Affairs of Glebe Lands) was in charge of

6) Amrañkyoñ: Rhwekuu Pagoda Inscription (B.E. 748), Sagaing, Line 7–11, see also Than Tun [1959b].

collecting the revenues from all the cultivated lands owned by Sasana. J. George Scott and J.P. Hardiman say that while a part of the revenues was actually spent on repair or decoration of the pagodas, a great deal of money was expended on the lavish reception and entertainment of foreign ambassadors [Scott and Hardiman 1901 (Vol. I Pt II): 432].

In view of these records, I am reluctant to accept the theory that the accumulation of land and labour under the Buddhist Church really affected the nation's economy. Ultimately, it was the state which gained all praedial rights to the religious lands although it was proved by the records of Restored Taungoo and Konebaung periods. In fact, land tenure in the dry zone was transformed according to a cyclic order. The king, as the ultimate owner, discharged land to the aristocrats, and the aristocrats dedicated it to Sasana; but Sasana was unable to prevail against economic and political crises and defend its seignior. Finally, the king, the perpetuator and defender of Sasana, took all the rights and responsibilities. In this way, the state would even have been strengthened by its gains from religious wealth.

#### IV Sasana Reforms

It is also difficult to prove that the Sasana reform was the attempt of the state to regain religious wealth, particularly the land and the labour accumulated under the control of the Sangha. There is a total lack of material testifying that any religious wealth was confiscated by the state through Sasana reform. Michael Aung-Thwin suggests that King Klacwa's attempt to confiscate some glebe

lands in A.D. 1235 was the same tactic that Burmese kings practised throughout history. There is only one lithic inscription telling the story which Michael Aung-Thwin gives in a close English version (p. 147) [Pl. 90; *SHMK* 1972: 268-269], but it does not reveal any evidence for Sasana reform undertaken by the king. All the available sources are silent about the Sasana reform under King Mohnyin Thado (r. 1426-40) (p. 205) and it would be much appreciated if we would be informed about the source materials used. Michael Aung-Thwin also points out that King Dammazedi's Sasana purification was a campaign against the Sangha's possessions (p. 146), but in fact it was clearly aimed at forcing the monks to observe the Vinaya strictly, because earning a livelihood by direct involvement in economic enterprises is considered the conduct of *Alajji* (corrupt) monks. Michael Aung-Thwin says "there was a structural contradiction between the king as benefactor and patron of the Religion on the one hand and the rivalry of state and Sangha over the resources of the kingdom on the other, . . ." [Aung-Thwin 1979: 684]. However, since land and labour endowments were very rarely made in Lower Burma, we need to be informed over what kind of resources there was the rivalry of state and Sangha.

In terms of political motives, King Dammazedi's Sasana reform was clearly an attempt to reinforce the ruler's place at the apex of the state as the perpetuator of Sasana, and on the other hand it was intended to prevent vagabonds, criminals and rebels taking refuge in religion.<sup>7)</sup> The qualifications for admission

7) I am deeply grateful to the two referees of this /



into the monkhood as a neophyte, as prescribed in the decree of King Dammazedi, clearly show his main objectives. In this decree, the chief monks are instructed that those wearing the saffron robe but earning their livelihood in secular ways without begging should be expelled from the monasteries; and the chief monks also had to promise the king not to ordain convicts, thieves, burglars, rebels, the aged, the sick, the disabled, and those who did not appeal for an audience [Tin 1963: 108]. The most reliable and contemporary source for Dammazedi's reform is the famous "Pegu Kalyani Sima inscription," left by King Dammazedi himself in 1480 on seven pillars constituting the longest of all the inscriptions found so far in Burma. Careful reading of this inscription reveals his main objectives with utmost clarity. As an elected king he had to justify himself as the guardian of the people and Sasana, because Burmese kings believed that it was the ruler's obligation to maintain social ethics and authentic Buddhism for their subjects. It was necessary for all usurpers and elected kings throughout Burmese history to justify their position as the rightful king and legitimate ruler. Dammazedi studied in Ava for some years and probably realized the corruption and the sectarianism among the Sangha in both Ava and Hanthawaddy. And it also seems that he wished Hanthawaddy to

supplant Ava in its role as the centre of Buddhism.

The Kalyani Sima inscription starts with the history of Buddhism, its spread to Ceylon and then to Suvarnabhumi (Thaton), the earliest Mon kingdom. It goes on to mention King Sanghabhodi Parakkamavahu of Ceylon, who oppressed all the pseudo-Buddhist sects and patronized the Mahavihara Sect, which he recognized as the orthodox church of Buddhism. It mentions the Sasana Reform sponsored by Pagan kings in the eleventh century, by sending a group of monks to Ceylon, and that King Dammazedi (Ramadipati) thereby also intended to purify Buddhism [Lu Pe Win 1958]. It is certain that the king had no economic interest in the purification of Sangha: his objective was rather to give strict discipline to the whole order to monks. Most of the kings from Theravada Southeast Asia imitated the Ceylonese model of religious reform, in which the state oppressed corruption and sectarianism among the monks by using sovereign power. This was a common occurrence in Burma and Thailand when "... there are so many wicked monks that is beyond [the Sangha's] power to admonish them..." as it is quoted by Yoneo Ishii from the Thai laws of three seals compiled in 1805 [Ishii 1986: 62].

## V Problems of Interpretation

Some archaic Burmese words found in the Pagan inscriptions have led to disagreement among scholars about their interpretation. This is reflected in the Burmese proverb, "Pugam Rajawan ko tut tham: proratay," literally meaning that one has to carry a stick

---

↘ journal for pointing out my wrong interpretation in the draft, which was inconsistent with the following statement in the text. In fact, the qualifications for admission into the order of monks prescribed by King Dammazedi seem to have been aimed at political schemers against the court and criminals punished socially by the law rather than shirkers of the royal dues, as I had previously interpreted them.

when talking about Pagan's history, because it will always lead to a quarrel. Sometimes the initial interpretation of a word is found inappropriate when the same word is found again in both earlier and later records. Such mistakes are often made by all scholars of early Burmese history. Than Tun has a high reputation for correcting his former interpretations which he later realized to be inaccurate [Than Tun 1975: 500-512].

I would like to discuss some of Michael Aung-Thwin's interpretations in his book. Having checked the sources cited, I am concerned about the author's conclusions about the fate of Mon King Manuha and his sister Queen Ma Paw, said to have been buried alive in the temple (p 33 n. 10). Furthermore, the definition of the phrase "sak siy" needs etymological analysis, because words borrowed from Pali, Sanskrit and Mon cannot be interpreted by consulting the meaning of each word or syllable.

Michael Aung-Thwin explains about the codified laws of Pagan. For the origin of the *Dammathats*, we cannot accept the inscription of A.D. 1187 as evidence for their authorship by the monk Sariputta, who compiled the *Dhammavilasa Dhamathat* for King Narapati-sithu. The name "Dhammavilas" in the original inscription clearly indicates a monk who built two pagodas in Sagaing in A.D. 1187, and has nothing to do with the *Dammathat*<sup>8)</sup> (p. 119 n. 12). All of the *Dammathats* (Law Codes) surviving in Burma were compiled in the later periods. Than Tun writes:

Another important fact we come across is

that the Pagan inscriptions made no mention of the *Dhammasattha*, the code of law or *Rajasattha*, the rulings, which were in general use in post-Pagan periods. Therefore it is tempting to conclude that there is no truth in the *Dhammasattha* of Burma claiming antiquity [Than Tun 1956: 46].

Thus we should not rely on the *Dammathats* for the reconstruction of the institutional history of Pagan, except for comparison of the institutions of different periods. I believe that there are some continuities in the socio-economic institutions from the Pagan period, but we should also note that major changes took place after the fall of Pagan. The Pinya-Sagaing and Ava periods witnessed instability in Burmese society for about two and a half centuries until the unification of the Second Burmese empire under the Taungoo kings. The state frequently had to try different techniques for the control of manpower throughout this period. The development of the *Asu-angan* system (platoon system) is one of the remarkable changes in this period. The *Dammathats*, the *Ameindaws* (royal edicts) and the *Sittans* (inquests) mostly reflect institutional changes of later periods. Therefore, to rely on data from the *Dammathats*, *Ameindaws* and *Sittans* as primary sources for the reconstruction of Pagan history will inevitably lead to a false picture.

#### Romanization

Burmese terms, personal names and place names, except for familiar names such as King Mohnyin Thado, King Mindon, Rangoon and Mandalay, are transliterated according to the rules of John Okell, *A Guide to the Romanization of Burmese*, London University, 1971.

#### Abbreviations in the Reference

ASB *Annual Reports of the Archaeological Survey,*

8) The inscription cited by Michael Aung-Thwin is *Sikhañdhammawilasa* inscription (B.E. 549) [SHMK 1972: 46-47].

- Burma. Rangoon: Department of Archaeological Research.
- List *A List of Inscriptions Found in Burma*. 1921. Edited by Chas Douroiselle. Rangoon: Government Press.
- MNK Mandalay-Nandwin-Kyauksayone.
- Pl. Plate Number of an Inscription given in the *Inscriptions of Burma*, five portfolios of photogravures. 1933, 1939, 1941, 1956, and 1957. Edited by Pe Maung Tin and G.H. Luce. London: Oxford University Press.
- PM Pagan Museum.
- SHMK *She-haung-myanma-kyauksa-mya*, Vol. 1. 1972. Edited by U. Nyein Maung. Rangoon: Department of Archaeological Research.
- UB *Inscription Collected in Upper Burma*. 1900. Rangoon: Government Press.
- Congress) Rangoon: Department of Historical Research.
- Lieberman, V.B. 1980. The Political Significance of Religious Wealth in Burmese History. *Journal of Asian Studies* 39(4).
- A List of Inscriptions Found in Burma (List)*. 1921. Edited by Chas Douroiselle. Rangoon: Government Press.
- Lu Pe Win, ed. 1985. *Kalyani Mon Kyauksa*. Rangoon: Department of Union Culture.
- Lun, Saya. 1920. Hamsawati Chañphrumya: rhañ i akroñ: arakhyup. *Journal of Burma Research Society* 10(1).
- Scott, J. George; and Hardiman, J.P. 1901. *Gazetteer of Upper Burma and Shan States*. Rangoon: Government Press.
- She-haung-myanma-kyauksa-mya (SHMK)*, Vol. 1. 1972. Edited by U. Nyein Maung. Rangoon: Department of Archaeological Research.
- Than Tun. 1956. History of Buddhism in Burma A.D. 1044-1300. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of London.
- . 1959a. Mahakassapa and His Tradition. *Journal of Burma Research Society* 42(2).
- . 1959b. History of Burma A.D. 1300-1400. *Journal of Burma Research Society* 42(2).
- . 1964. *Khethaung-Myanma-Yazawin*. Rangoon: Mahadagon Press.
- . 1975. *Athitmyin-Bhama-Thamaing*. Mandalay: Myakantha Sapay.
- Than Tun, ed. 1985. *Royal Orders of Burma*. Kyoto: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University.
- Tin, U. 1963. *Myanma-Min-Okchokpumpumsadan*. Vol. III. Rangoon: Government Press.
- Trager, Frank N.; and Koenig, J. William. 1979. *Burmese Sit-tans (1764-1826)*. University of Arizona Press.

### References

- Annual Reports of the Archaeological Survey, Burma (ASB)*. Rangoon, Burma: Department of Archaeological Research.
- Aung-Thwin, Michael. 1979. The Role of Sasana Reform in Burmese History: Economic Dimensions of Religious Purification. *Journal of Asian Studies* 38(4).
- Inscription Collected in Upper Burma (UB)*. 1900. Rangoon: Government Press.
- Inscriptions of Burma*, five portfolios of photogravures (Pl.). 1933, 1939, 1941, 1956, and 1957. Edited by Pe Maung Tin and G.H. Luce. London: Oxford University Press.
- Ishii, Yoneo. 1986. *Sangha, State and Society; Thai Buddhism in History*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Khin Khin Sein, Daw. 1971. Pagan-khet-kywanmya (MS). (A paper read to Burma Research